

**To:** CN=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;king.david@epa.gov;Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov[];  
ing.david@epa.gov;Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov[];  
lawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov;fischer.douglas@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov[];  
ischer.douglas@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov[]; arbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov[]  
**Cc:** []  
**Bcc:** CN=Walter Mugdan/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US[]  
**From:** CN=Walter Mugdan/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Thur 7/14/2011 9:12:55 PM  
**Subject:** Hudson Model

As discussed this morning, I did call and speak with John Haggard today. I explained that we could not afford to continue to invest to any significant extent in continued review of GE's model. I suggested that we would be prepared to send GE the memo we had already prepared with further comments about the model, provided GE would be willing to share with us the additional runs and code that QEA has generated in the past few months. We anticipated that GE would in due course seek to have the model peer reviewed, and while I did not expect that EPA would play an active role in that process (and in any event not as a joint sponsor of the model), we would certainly be interested in the process and outcome.

John said he would run this back through his folks, but expected that there would be no hesitation on GE's part to sharing the new model runs and code, and they would be interested in receiving our memo. He will get back to me in a few days.